

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/782,899	02/23/2004	Minoru Fujimori	2004_0290	5937	
7590 07/21/2006			EXAMINER		
Thomas J. Kowalski, Esq.			WHITEMAN, BRIAN A		
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP 745 Fifth Avenue			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
New York, NY 10151			1635		
			DATE MAILED: 07/21/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/782,899	FUJIMORI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Brian Whiteman	1635	

	Brian Whiteman	1635	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence add	iress
THE REPLY FILED 28 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or this application, applicant must timely file one of the fol places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a N (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in com following time periods: 	on the same day as filing a Notic lowing replies: (1) an amendmen Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee pliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The	e of Appeal. To avoid al t, affidavit, or other evid) in compliance with 37 (lence, which CFR 41.31; or
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date		n the final rejection, whichev	oria latar In na
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Acevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b)	han SIX MONTHS from the mailing da	te of the final rejection.	
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07		E FIRST REFLT WAS FILE	,D WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date o been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened s above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mont earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	n which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 and the corresponding amount of the t statutory period for reply originally set in	ee. The appropriate extension the final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37) as set forth in (b)
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in cor of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must AMENDMENTS 	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37	'(e)), to avoid dismissal	of the appeal.
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection	n, but prior to the date of filing a	orief, will <u>not</u> be entered	because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further of (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE be	consideration and/or search (see		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in b appeal; and/or			g the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1		y rejected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1		n-Compliant Amendmen	nt (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection			,
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be the non-allowable claim(s). 		ate, timely filed amendr	nent canceling
7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a how the new or amended claims would be rejected is put the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	a) ⊠ will not be entered, or b) ☐ rovided below or appended.) will be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: 22.		•	
Claim(s) objected to: <u>20</u> .			•
Claim(s) rejected: 4,6,7,10-14,16,19,21,24 and 25.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <i>None</i> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	but but a few and the data of filing	a Natice of Annacl will	not be entered
8. A The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good a and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	and sufficient reasons why the af	fidavit or other evidence	is necessary
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necess	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under a ary and was not earlier presented	ppeal and/or appellant f d. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)	ails to provide a)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanate REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	tion of the status of the claims af	er entry is below or atta	iched.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered See Continuation Sheet.	but does NOT place the applicati	on in condition for allow	ance because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Pa	per No(s). <u>6/28/06</u>	

- 13. Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The limitation 'bacterium belonging to the genus Bifidobacterium selected from the group consisting of Bifidobacterium adolescentis, Bifidobacterium longum, Bifidobacterium bifidum, Bifidobacterium pseudolongum, Bifidobacterium thermophilium, Bifidobacterium breve and Bifidobacterium infantis; having a promoter and terminator involved in expressing a gene encoding a histone-like DNA-binding protein belonging to the genus of Bifidobacterium' in proposed new claims would require further search and consideration and raise the issue of new matter.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicant's argument against the 112 enablement rejection that Argnani supports practicing the claimed invention because the main objection is a convenient and reproducible method to genetically transform bacteria of the genus bifidobacterium, applicant's argument is not found persuasive because Argnani supports the unpredicitability of using the claimed genus of Bifidobacterium in the claimed invention because Argnani teaches the inability of plasmids to replicate in B.animalis and other Bifidobacterium strains (page 113). In response to applicant's argument againt the 112 first paragraph enablement rejection that Yazawa (breast cancer research and treatment, Vol. 66, pp. 165-170, 2001) concludes that bacterium belonging to the genus of bifidobacterium can be used and the statement is not limited to B. longum, is not found persuasive because the statement by Yazawa does not provide the teaching lacking from the specification for practing the full scope of the claimed invention without an undue amount of experimentation. In addition, the argument is not found persuasive because the article is a post-filing reference indicated that the claimed invention was not enabled as of the filing date. See MPEP2164.05(a).

The references cited for support of applicant's argument against the enablement rejection are not considered because the applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the articles are necessary and were not earlier presented. In addition, the references cites on the IDS have not been considered because the IDS is not accompanied by a statement under 37 CFR 1.97(e). Applicant's argument against the 112 second paragraph are moot because the argument is based on proposed new claims that have not been entered.

Applicant's argument againt the 103 have already been addressed and are not found persuasive for the reasons of record. See final rejection mailed on 3/28/06.

Continuation of 13. Other: At page 12 of the response, Applicant set forth a request for an interview with the Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor in the event that the application was not found to be in condition for allowance. This request was attached to an amendment which must be acted on by the Office in a timely fashion. In the future, Applicant is invited to contact the Examiner's supervisor directly to arrange any interviews prior to the submission of amendments, so that any remaining issues can be discussed in a timely fashion.

RICHARD SCHNIZER, PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINER